UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,	: CIVIL A	CTION	
Plaintiff, V.	: No. 2:14-cv-02477-LDD		
JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address 108.36.223.215,	: :		
Defendant,	• •		
	ORDER		
AND NOW, on this	_ day of	, 2014, upon consideration of	
Defendant John Doe's Motion for Pr	rotective Order reg	arding Plaintiff's third party subpoena	
directed to Verizon Internet Services	s, and any response	thereto, it is hereby ORDERED and	
DECREED that:			
1. Said Motion is GRA	Said Motion is GRANTED ;		
2. Counsel for Defendar	nt John Doe subscr	iber assigned IP address 108.36.223.215	
("Defendant") shall provide Plaintif	f's counsel with the	e name and address of the Defendant;	
3. Plaintiff SHALL mai	ntain Defendant's	name in confidence and SHALL NOT	
disclose Defendant's name in the pu	blic record.		
4. In light of Defendant	's willingness to vo	oluntarily disclose his name and address to	
Plaintiff, Third Party Verizon Intern	et Services is hereb	by excused from responding to Plaintiff's	
subpoena.			
	BY THE	COURT:	
	HONOR	ABLE LEGROME D. DAVIS	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, : CIVIL ACTION

:

Plaintiff, :

V. : No. 2:14-cv-02477-LDD

:

JOHN DOE subscriber assigned: IP address 108.36.223.215, :

Defendant, :

MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER RE THIRD PARTY SUBPOENA

Defendant John Doe, by and through his undersigned attorneys, hereby moves for a protective order in connection with Plaintiff's Subpoena to third party Verizon Internet Services. In support hereof, Defendant avers as follows:

- 1. This matter arises, at least in part, from the alleged downloading of pornographic movies from the internet by Defendant on his personal computer in the privacy of his home.
- 2. Defendant did not knowingly distribute any alleged copyrighted material to any third party.
 - 3. Defendant is embarrassed and humiliated by this matter.
- 4. Public disclosure of Defendant's name will only further serve to humiliate and embarrass him, and this is before Plaintiff's claims of infringement are actually proven.
- 5. Other courts have allowed nearly identical matters to proceed anonymously, recognizing that the interests in protecting defendant's privacy and reputational interests outweighs the need for public disclosure of the defendant's identity.
- 6. Defendant's counsel, Robert Eyre, has proposed a stipulation to Plaintiff that would provide Plaintiff the requested discovery while keeping John Doe's given name out of the public record.

Case 2:14-cv-02477-LDD Document 8 Filed 07/15/14 Page 3 of 7

7. Plaintiff's counsel never responded to Mr. Eyre's proposed stipulation.

8. Since Defendant has offered Plaintiff the very information Plaintiff seeks from the

third party subpoena, and given Plaintiff's refusal to so stipulate, it leads at least to an inference

that Plaintiff intends to use John Doe's information for the purpose of public humiliation and

embarrassment.

9. Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the entry of the Protective Order. On the other

hand, Defendant John Doe faces significant prejudice that cannot be undone if the Order is not

granted.

WHEREFORE, Defendant John Doe respectfully requests that the Court grant his Motion

for a Protective Order and enter the accompanying proposed Order.

FOEHL & EYRE, P.C.

DATED: July 15, 2014

By: s/ ROBERT E. EYRE

ROBERT B. EYRE, ESQUIRE PA ATTY I.D. NO. 41990

27 E. Front Street

Media, PA 19063

(215) 566-5926

Attorneys for Defendant

John Doe

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, : CIVIL ACTION

:

Plaintiff, :

V. : No. 2:14-cy-02477-LDD

:

JOHN DOE subscriber assigned :

IP address 108.36.223.215,

:

Defendant, :

MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Defendant John Doe, by and through his undersigned attorneys, hereby respectfully submits this Memorandum of Law in support of his Motion for Protective Order.

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter arises, at least in part, from the alleged downloading of pornographic movies from the internet by Defendant on his personal computer in the privacy of his home. Defendant did not knowingly distribute any alleged copyrighted material to any third party.

Defendant is embarrassed and humiliated as a result of this matter. Public disclosure of Defendant's name will only serve to further humiliate and embarrass Defendant. Such public disclosure and humiliation serves no legitimate interest of the Plaintiff.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

Normally, litigants should identify themselves. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(a). The judicial principle is that courts are to be conducted in public. <u>Doe v. Megless</u>, 654. F.3d 404 (3d. Cir. 2011). However, a litigant may proceed anonymously when he or she shows there is a reasonable fear of severe harm that outweighs the public's interest in open judicial proceedings. <u>Id</u>. In <u>Megless</u>, the Third Circuit adopted the Provident Life test for weigh the litigant's need for anonymity against the traditional rule of openness. Id. at 410.

District Courts may allow a party to proceed anonymously when there are exceptional circumstances. "Examples of areas where courts have allowed pseudonyms include cases involving 'abortion, birth control, transsexuality, mental illness, welfare rights of illegitimate children, AIDS, and homosexuality." Id. (citing Doe v. Borough of Morrisville, 130 F.R.D. 612, 614 (E.D. Pa. 1990)).

In re: Bittorrent Adult Film Copyright Infingement Cases, No. 12-1154, is instructive here. In that case, the Eastern District of New York allowed defendants to proceed anonymously, holding that:

On the other side of the equation, there is an "atypically weak public interest in knowing the [defendant's] identit[y]." <u>Sealed Plaintiff</u>, 537 F.3d at 189. This action is part of a spate of similar actions involving hundreds of thousands of defendants accused of the type of infringement alleged here. <u>In re BitTorrent</u>, 2012 WL 1570765 at *1. In fact, a Westlaw search reveals that this plaintiff has brought scores of similar actions involving thousands of John Doe defendants. Thus, in this instance, the incremental value to public of the identity of a single defendant is minimal, representing but a drop in a litigative ocean. Thus, applying the <u>Sealed Plaintiff</u> test to this case reveals that the defendant's interest in anonymity substantially outweighs the public interest in the single data point of the defendant's identity."

Here, Defendant's counsel, Robert Eyre, has proposed a stipulation to Plaintiff that would provide Plaintiff with the requested discovery while keeping John Doe's given name out of the public record. Plaintiff's counsel never responded to Mr. Eyre's proposed stipulation. It may simply be that Plaintiff's counsel is busy managing the "litigative ocean" as the court above called it. However, it is also possible to infer that Plaintiff intends to use John Doe's information for the purpose of public humiliation and embarrassment.

Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the entry of the Protective Order. Defendant's identifying information will be provided to Plaintiff. Plaintiff simply cannot make it a matter of

public record. On the other hand, Defendant John Doe faces significant prejudice that cannot be undone if the Order is not granted.

III. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Defendant John Doe respectfully requests that the Court grant his Motion for a Protective Order and enter the accompanying proposed Order.

Respectfully submitted,

FOEHL & EYRE, P.C.

DATED: July 15, 2014 By: s/ROBERT E. EYRE

ROBERT B. EYRE, ESQUIRE PA ATTY I.D. NO. 41990 27 E. Front Street Media, PA 19063 (215) 566-5926 Attorneys for Defendant John Doe

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this date, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Protective Order re Third Party Subpoena and supporting Memorandum of Law to be served upon the following at the address and manner of service indicated:

VIA ECF ELECTRONIC FILING:

Christopher P. Fiore, Esq. Fiore & Barber 418 Main Street Harleysville, PA 19438 Attorneys for Plaintiff

DATED: July 15, 2014

s/ Patrick K. McCoyd

PATRICK K. McCOYD, ESQUIRE